



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XOPOT IN TERENCE'S *HEAUTON*, THE SHIFTING OF
CHORAL RÔLES IN MENANDER, AND AGATHON'S
'EMBOAIMA¹

BY ROY C. FLICKINGER

I

Terence's version of Menander's *Heauton Timorumenos* opens with a dialogue between Chremes and Menedemus, in the course of which the former invites his neighbor to the rural Dionysia he is on the point of celebrating at his home. Upon Menedemus' refusal of the invitation and withdrawal from the scene Chremes soliloquizes:

Lacrumas excussit mihi
miseretque me eius. Sed ut diei tempus est,
tempust monere me hunc uicinum Phanium
ad cenam ut ueniat; ibo, uisam si domist.—
Nil opus fuit monitore: iam dudum domi
praesto apud me esse aiunt (vss. 167 ff.).

Such an evacuation of the stage in the middle of the scene is, so far as I know, without parallel in either Plautus or Terence. Moreover, Phania is neither one of the dramatic personages nor even mentioned again, and Chremes' momentary withdrawal at this place apparently serves no dramatic purpose. No student of Terence can disregard these difficulties, which have given rise to or have seemed to substantiate charges of wholesale alteration or of *contaminatio*. At the least, they have placed those who believe Terence translated but one play with no essential modifications under the disagreeable necessity of discovering a plausible explanation.² It may be added that there is some uncertainty whether Act I stops at vs. 212 (according to the vulgate) or at vs. 229,³ and that neither arrangement satisfies Donatus' *dictum*: "est igitur attente animaduertendum, ubi et quando scaena uacua sit ab omnibus personis, ita ut in ea chorus

¹ Cf. *Class. Phil.* VI (1911) 485.

² Cf. Köhler *De Hautontimorumeni Terentianae compositione* 6, n. 1 and (for the literature) 1, notes.

³ So the most recent editor, Ballentine (1910).

uel tibicen obaudiri possint. quod cum uiderimus, ibi actum esse finitum debemus agnoscere" (Wessner I, 38 f.). In my opinion, these "*incohérences ou maladresses de mise en scène*"¹ all find a solution in the information derivable from certain recently discovered data.

The repeated occurrence of the term χοροῦ in the new Menander papyri² has disclosed the technique of certain forms of *Aktschlüsse* in New Comedy and engaged scholars in a diligent search for similar passages in Plautus, Terence, and the Greek comic fragments. It is now well established that the Νέα usually employed a chorus that took no part in the action of the piece but merely appeared to furnish entertainment between acts. Its entrance is frequently alluded to. Thus, in the Jernstedt fragment³ the chorus is introduced as follows:

Onesimus. ἴωμεν δεῦρο πρὸς Χαρίσιον.
 Chaerestratus. ἴωμεν, ὥς καὶ μεираκυλλίων ὄχλος
 εἰς τὸν τόπον τις ἔρχεθ' ὑποβεβρεγμένων,
 οἷς μὴ ᾽νοχλεῖν εὐκαιρον εἶναί μοι δοκεῖ.
 XOΠOT

Similarly, six lines before the appearance of XOΠOT in the text of the *Perikeiromene* we are warned of the on-coming chorus in the following words:

μεθίοντα μεράκια προσέρχεται
 πάμπολλ' κτλ.⁴

These youths are probably Polemon's boon companions who took breakfast with him in the country and have now come to his house in the city to be on hand for the dinner in the evening.⁵ Again, in the *Epitrepontes* the chorus consists of Charisius' guests at a banquet, whose coming is announced in the regular way by one of the actors:

νυνὶ μὲν οὖν συνάγουσι⁶ καὶ
 οὐκ ἔστιν εὐκαιρον τὸ μνηνεύει ἴσως
 αὐτῷ περὶ τούτων· αὐριον δέ.⁷

¹ Legrand *Rev. études grec.* XVI (1903) 353.

² Once each in the *Epitrepontes*, *Perikeiromene*, Jernstedt fragment, and *Samia*, and twice in the Ghorân fragments. For the latter, cf. *Bull. corr. hellen.* XXX, 106, 148. The last three instances do not throw any light upon the meaning of χοροῦ, except as showing that it was frequently employed in the dramatic papyri.

³ Cf. Capps *Four Plays of Menander* 98 f.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.* 160 f.

⁵ The evidence for this is given in detail by Capps 144.

⁶ "Intrans., *they're getting together*, i.e., for entertainment" (Capps *ad loc.*).

⁷ *Ibid.* 71 and 31.

The word **XOΠOT** occurring in the papyrus within five lines of this passage indicates that the act is at an end and the chorus in action. Finally, we are indebted to Leo¹ for having detected a similar passage in the fragments of Middle Comedy (cf. Meineke III, 428 [Alexis' *Kouρίς*]):

καὶ γὰρ < μεθύσων > ἐπὶ κῶμον ἀνθρώπων ὄρῳ
 πλήθος προσιόν· ὃ τῶν καλῶν τε ἀγαθῶν
 ἐνθάδε συνόντων· μὴ γένοιτό μοι μόνῳ
 νύκτωρ ἀπαντῆσαι καλῶς πεπραγόν
 ὑμῖν περὶ τὸν βαλλισμόν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε
 θοιμάτιον ἀπενέγκαιμι μὴ φύσας πτερά.

Here we find the technical designation (*κῶμος*) for the sort of chorus that was customary in Menander, and there can be little doubt that **XOΠOT** occurred in the dramatic text after these lines. Finally, it will be noted that these four choruses represented *κῶμοι* of drunken young men engaged in a revel or of banqueters or both.²

We are now in a position to consider the *Heauton* once more. When Chremes re-enters the stage from Phania's house, he says:

Nil opus fuit monitore: iam dudum domi
 praesto apud me esse aiunt. Egomet conuiuias moror (vss. 171 ff.).

In view of the foregoing digression the word *conuiuias* at once strikes the attention. It is clear that Chremes' withdrawal was of longer duration than the bare text would indicate, and that in this interval a group of guests, on their way to the Dionysian celebration at his house, arrived on the scene and gave a performance. Therefore **XOΠOT** must have appeared in Menander's text at this point, and we are no longer dependent upon Köhler's ingenious explanation: "[Terentius] statim ab initio fabulae eos Chremetis mores prorsus perspectos habere vult, qui dum aliena curat, suorum officiorum obliviscitur."³

¹ Cf. *Hermes* XLIII (1908) 308 ff.

² Cf. Bethe *Ber. d. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* (1908) 222: "Denn der Chor der *véa* ist stets ein und derselbe, eben der *κῶμος μεθύντων*, der dem Gotte des Festes singt." But this statement is not broad enough. Besides the chorus of huntsmen in the *Hero* (cf. Capps, pp. 6, 21) and that of *ancillae* mentioned below (p. 27), surely the *piscatores* in the *Rudens*, the *advocati* in the *Poenulus*, and the *lorarii* in the *Captivi* are survivals of the Greek chorus (cf. Leo *Plaut. Forschungen* 217 n. 1). Furthermore, Körte (*N. Jahrb. f. kl. Alt.* V [1900] 89, n. 2) has compiled the following list of titles which seem to be derived from the personnel of their choruses: Menander's 'Αλαῖς, 'Αλιεῖς, Κυβερνήται, and Στρατιῶται, Posidippus' Δημόται Χορεύουσαι, and Diphilus' Δαναῖδες, Ἐλληβορίζονοι, and Ἐναγίζοντες. Aristophanes' *Frogs*, however, shows that such evidence must be used with caution.

³ Cf. *De Hautont. Ter. compositione* 6, n. 1.

By the same token Act II of the *Heauton* should begin neither at vs. 213 nor at 230, but at 171; that is, if the Roman division into acts is to conform to that of the Greek originals. Donatus understood the principle well enough (cf. "hoc etiam ut cetera huiusmodi poemata quinque actus habeat necesse est *choris diuisos a Graecis poetis*" [Wessner II, 4]), but it was also well recognized why the rule was not easy to apply (cf. "postremo ne locum quidem [sc. *choris*] reliquerunt, quod Latini fecerunt comici, unde apud illos dirimere actus quinquepartitos difficile est" [Euanthius, Wessner I, 18]). Another instance of this appears in the same play. At vss. 245 and 254 we are informed that certain women are approaching with a *grex ancillarum*. They do not actually arrive, however, until vs. 381; and it is likely that, when the actors depart at the end of the act (vs. 409), the *ancillae* tarry to fill up the intermission with a performance. That they are numerous enough for such a purpose appears from vs. 451 (*plus decem*). They are referred to still again at vs. 744:

ancillas omnis Bacchidis traduce huc ad uos propere,

which serves as an excuse for their reappearance four lines below, when the stage is again empty.¹ As for beginning Act III at vs. 410, the new evidence merely confirms the old arrangement, but the traditional opening of Act IV comes at vs. 613, where not a single actor leaves the stage. There can now be no doubt that vs. 749 makes a far preferable point of division, and some editors had already adopted it independently.

The fact that the Latin comedies were given a practically continuous performance rendered the attempt to divide them into acts far from easy and largely meaningless.² In fact, the ancient and

¹ For observing these details and noting their significance we are indebted to Köhler *op. cit.* 24, n. 1 and Leo *Der Monolog im Drama* 59, n. 2.

² Cf. Euanthius in the text above and Donatus: "actus sane implicatiores sunt in ea et qui non facile a parum doctis distinguere possint, ideo quia tenendi spectatoris causa uult poeta noster omnes quinque actus uelut unum fieri," etc. (Wessner I, 266), and "difficile est diuisionem actuum in Latinis fabulis internoscere obscure editam" (*ibid.* 38). Of course, intermissions were sometimes secured by the interpolation of flute-playing, as is avouched by *Pseudolus* 573 and the passage from Donatus above cited (p. 25). The *Liber glossarum* (*Rh. Mus.* XXVIII, 418 f.) also testifies to the employment of choruses by Plautus: "apud Romanos quoque Plautus comediae choros exemplo Graecorum inseruit," which probably refers to the survivals already mentioned (p. 26, n. 2, above).

modern conceptions of an "act" are so different that Leo has done a real service in the direction of clearer thinking by reverting to the Greek term, μέρος. Entirely disregarding the traditional divisions and depending upon complete withdrawal of the actors from the stage as the chief criterion, he has divided Plautus' and Terence's plays into from three or four to seven μέρη each, and has found substantiation for his rearrangements in the fact that there results a fairly consistent dramatic technique in the use of monologues to open and close each μέρος.¹ In one instance his procedure has met with striking confirmation. He divided Plautus' *Bacchides* into seven μέρη and placed one of the new points of division after vs. 108, as Ritschl had also proposed long ago. He has since observed that vs. 107

simul huic nescio cui, turbare qui huc it, decedamus <hinc>

contains the typical formula such as was used in New Comedy to motivate the actors' retirement and to introduce the chorus at the close of an act.²

II

But there is another result obtained through the new explanation of *Heauton* vss. 170 ff. The first chorus, at vs. 171, consisted of *conuiuiae* and the second, at vss. 409 and 748, of *ancillae*; in other words, at last we have a well-authenticated example of a chorus appearing in different rôles in different parts of the same play. The most available means of combating this conclusion is to charge that the *Heauton* is the product of *contaminatio* and that the two choruses come from different originals. On this subject there are three opinions: (1) that the play is contaminated, (2) that it is not contaminated, and (3) that it is not contaminated but that the Greek original received very considerable modifications from Terence's own hand.³ As to the second hypothesis nothing need be said. The third hypothesis, also, has no adverse bearing upon the present

¹ Cf. *Der Monolog* 50-62.

² Cf. *Hermes* XLVI (1911) 292 ff. Leo indicated that we should expect a plural *his nescio quibus, turbare qui huc eunt* or a collective noun like *coetu hominum*. The emendation *turbare quae* has occurred to Professor Capps and myself independently, but presupposes actual use of a chorus, or a translation so literal as to disregard its absence.

³ For the literature cf. Köhler *De Hautont. Ter. compositione* (1908), p. 1, notes.

question, for whatever modifications Terence may have introduced would have been in order to gain some distinctly dramatic advantage, and this would not have been true of the situation created by Chremes' momentary withdrawal at vs. 170—the passage has every indication of being *uerbum de uerbo expressum* (*Ad.* vs. 11).¹ It is not feasible to enter into a discussion of the first hypothesis here. The latest writer on the subject, after a minute and thorough investigation, expresses his convictions as follows: “itaque nihil esse apparet, cur non totam hanc fabulam unius Menandri consilio attribuamus mereque eam a Terentio translatam credamus.”² It should be considered further that, granting the *contaminatio*, it must still be proved that vss. 170 ff., on the one hand, and the verses in which the *ancillae* figure, on the other hand, belong to different originals. As a matter of fact, few scholars who believe in the contamination of the play would undertake such a task. For example, the latest defender of this theory, Skutsch, is quite content with attempting to refute the unitarian interpretation of vss. 4 and 6 of the prologue, without entering upon a detailed analysis of the play proper.³

If Capps is right in assigning the Jernstedt fragment to the *Epitrepontes*, the identity of the chorus is not maintained in that play, also. We have seen (p. 25) that the first chorus consists of Charisius' guests at a banquet who arrive on the scene just in time to furnish entertainment between acts. At the conclusion of their performance they pass on into the house, and Act III opens with a monologue. After eleven verses Habrotonon enters the scene and, in accordance with a convention often found in Plautus and Terence, while passing through the door speaks to the guests within (i.e., the chorus) who have been annoying her:

ἐὰντέ μ', ἱκετεύω σε, καὶ μή μοι κακὰ
παρέχεται.⁴

¹ Cf. Nencini *De Terentio eiusque fontibus*, p. 70.

² Cf. Köhler *op. cit.* 37.

³ Cf. *Philologus* LIX (1900) 1 ff.

⁴ Cf. Capps, p. 73. This is substantially the view first proposed by Körte *Hermes* XLIII (1908) 303 f. Most of Bethe's criticisms (*Ber. d. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* [1908] 211 f.) are erroneous; so far as they are sound, the above interpretation avoids them.

At the end of this act (in the Jernstedt fragment) the chorus is again announced as follows:

Onesimus. ἴωμεν δεῦρο πρὸς Χαρίσιον.
Chaerestratus. ἴωμεν, ὥς καὶ μειρακυλλίων ὄχλος
 εἰς τὸν τόπον τις ἔρχεθ' ὑποβεβρεγμένων,
 οἷς μὴ ᾽νοχλεῖν εὐκαιρον εἶναι μοι δοκεῖ.
 ΧΟΡΟΥ¹

It will be at once observed that, though both choruses are similarly constituted, their identity is not preserved, for this κῶμος is approaching down the street through one of the *πάροδοι*, while the other had disappeared within the *σκηνὴ* at the beginning of the act. Of course, both companies were represented by the same set of *χορευταί*, but the poet had no compelling motive for keeping the connection between them unbroken. From the spectators' point of view the two bands were quite distinct—one a group of guests, thus standing in definite relationship to one of the *dramatis personae*, the other a chance crowd of drunken youths who only by accident came down the street and before the houses represented by the proscenium.²

Bethe is unalterably opposed to any interpretation of Menander's fragments which will result in a change of rôle on the part of the chorus within a play. Besides disputing such instances as had been

¹ Cf. Capps 98.

² The above would also be fatal to Bethe's view that a chorus in New Comedy "nur beim ersten Auftreten angekündigt wurde" (*op. cit.* 223 f.). In deference to Bethe's objections (*ibid.* 217 ff.) I have refrained from citing the *Perikeiromene*. Here the chorus at the close of Act II consists of Polemon's boon companions (Capps 144, 160 f.); for the close of the next act Körte (*Hermes* XLIII, 302) infers a chorus of soldiers (disputable); and for the close of Act IV Robert (see his translation *ad loc.*) inserts a chorus of farmers (pure conjecture). The parallel which Bethe cites from the *Eunuchus*, however, is not so conclusive as he imagines. To the three soldiers whom Bethe recognizes must be added Sanga (cf. *Eun.*, vss. 776 and 781); and four *χορευταί* sufficed in Greece in the second century B.C. (cf. Baunack in Collitz' *S.G.D.I.* II, 2569) and seven in the third (cf. *ibid.* 2563-66). À propos of these last, cf. Bethe *op. cit.* 222: "Solch ein κῶμος ist der Chor gewesen, der die Zwischenakte der *νέα* und z. T. wenigstens der *μέση* ausfüllte. Solch ein κῶμος wird auch gemeint sein mit den sieben *χορευταί κωμικοί*, die stehend am Schluss der Siegerlisten der delphischen Soterien des III. Jahrhunderts erscheinen," and in the footnote: "Diese Vermutung (s. meine *Prolegomena Theat.* 248, 28) darf jetzt als bestätigt gelten." It is interesting to compare with this Bethe's actual statement in his *Prolegomena*: "Die 7 *χορευταί κωμικοί* . . . haben sicherlich nicht 'alte Komödie' des Aristophanes u.s.w. aufgeführt, . . . ja sie haben offenbar mit dem komischen Drama überhaupt nichts gemein. . . . Vielleicht haben sie sich *in den Pausen zwischen den drei Komödien* producirt," etc. (italics mine).

cited, he has brought forward also the following general considerations: "Es gibt, soweit ich weiss, weder Komödie noch Tragödie, in der der Chor seine Person wechselte, auch im Plutos geschieht es nicht: da sollten die Dichter der neuen Komödie, für die der Chor nichts bedeutete, gerade für diesen weder sie noch das Publikum interessierenden Rest alten Herkommens neue Erfindungen gemacht und besonderen Aufwand verlangt haben? Doch solche Erwägungen überzeugen nicht."¹ It is apparent, however, that the chorus greatly changed in function during Middle and New Comedy, and we must be content to follow wherever the evidence may lead, quite regardless of preconceived notions or general considerations. So long as we were dependent upon fragmentary papyri, which scholars could not indisputably arrange in proper order or even be certain to what plays they should be assigned, Bethe's task was not a hard one. But the evidence just adduced from Terence's *Heauton* can not be brushed aside so easily.

III

It seems clear that the songs of the chorus in the intermissions marked by XOΠOT (if songs not recorded in the text were sung) were ἐμβόλιμα in Aristotle's use of that term (cf. *Poetics* 1456a 26-32): καὶ τὸν χορὸν δὲ ἓνα δεῖ ὑπολαβεῖν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν καὶ μόριον εἶναι τοῦ ὅλου καὶ συναγωνίζεσθαι μὴ ὥσπερ Εὐριπίδῃ ἀλλ' ὥσπερ Σοφοκλεῖ. τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς τὰ ἀδόμενα <οὐδὲν> μᾶλλον τοῦ μύθου ἢ ἄλλης τραγῳδίας ἐστίν· διὸ ἐμβόλιμα ἄδουσιν πρῶτον ἄρξαντος Ἀγάθωνος τοῦ τοιούτου. καίτοι τί διαφέρει ἢ ἐμβόλιμα ἄδειν ἢ εἰ ῥῆσιν ἐξ ἄλλου εἰς ἄλλο ἀρμάττοι ἢ ἐπεισόδιον ὅλον; It is therefore not surprising to find such a development before the time of New Comedy—in Middle Comedy (cf. p. 26 above) or even at the close of Old Comedy. In fact, the *Vita* credits Aristophanes with anticipating the poets of New Comedy in this very particular (cf. πάλιν δὲ ἐκκλειυπότος καὶ τοῦ χορηγεῖν τὸν Πλοῦτον γράφας, εἰς τὸ διαναπαύεσθαι τὰ σκηνικὰ πρόσωπα καὶ μετεσκευάσθαι ἐπιγράφει "χοροῦ" φθεγγόμενος ἐν ἐκείνοις· ἃ καὶ ὁρῶμεν τοὺς νέους οὕτως ἐπιγράφοντας ζῆλῳ Ἀριστοφάνους);² and XOΠOT actually

¹ Cf. *Ber. d. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* (1908) 214 f.

² The absurdities of this notice are patent enough and need not be enumerated (cf. Körte *Hermes* XLIII [1908] 39); but the main fact is now fully substantiated.

appears in R after *Eccles.* 729 and 876, and KOMMATION XOΠOT in R and V after *Plutus* 770, while many editors print XOΠOT at some seven other points in these two plays on the attestation of the scholia, inferior MSS, or early editions, or because the action seems to demand a pause.¹ Another anticipation of New Comedy is found in the fact that at least occasionally the chorus is absent from the scene during ἐπεισόδια; no one doubts that this happens at *Eccles.* 310, but it seems probable at other points as well. Again, Cario's words in *Plutus* vss. 766 f.:

μή νυν μέλλ' ἔτι,
ὥς ἄνδρες ἐγγύς εἰσιν ἤδη τῶν θυρῶν,

followed after three lines by KOMMATION XOΠOT, appear at first glance to be the prototype of the typical New Comedy announcement of the chorus' approach; but the chorus (or semi-chorus?) is already on the scene. The current view with regard to these instances of XOΠOT in Aristophanes seems to be that enunciated by Ritter as long ago as 1828—that the words of the στάσιμα were of such slight importance as to be omitted by the poet in publication.² The possibility must further be considered that Aristophanes provided for these pauses as he did in his earliest period for the ἔξοδοι, by borrowing from earlier poets any popular songs that pleased his fancy,³ or even that he may have composed music and dance movements without any libretto. Perhaps there is a hint of the latter alternative in *Plutus* vss. 760 f.:

ἀλλ' εἴ' ἀπαξάπαντες ἐξ ἑνὸς λόγου
ὀρχεῖσθε καὶ σκιρτᾶτε καὶ χορεύετε,

followed at vs. 770 by KOMMATION XOΠOT. But in any case, it seems generally agreed that the absence of a text at these points in our MSS is not due to loss in transmission but to the

¹ XOΠOT is found also at *Nubes* 888, but this instance belongs to an entirely different category from those discussed above. In this case the sign is an indication that Aristophanes failed to complete his revision of this play; in other words, he rejected the ode which had originally stood here in the first edition and never provided a substitute, cf. Starkie's edition, pp. liii and 200 f.

² Cf. his *De Aristophanis Pluto*, pp. 13 f.: "suspicio poetam ea [sc. cantica], non ut domi legerentur, sed ut in orchestra canerentur, composuisse, solis choreutis tradidisse, non inseruisse exemplaribus in publicum emittendis," and the context.

³ Cf. Starkie's *Wasps*, p. xxiii.

fact that Aristophanes, for whatever reason, furnished none for publication.

It is customary to hold Euripides largely responsible for the intermezzic character of the fourth-century *στάσιμα*, though he is not without defenders.¹ The first half of the above quotation from the *Poetics* really implies the same *kind* of criticism of Euripides as is stated in the latter half concerning Agathon; for, though the former refers primarily to the lack of connection between Euripides' choruses and actors as regards personnel,² the natural consequence of this would be choral odes of indifferent relation to the plot. In view of this criticism, it is unlikely that by *ἐμβόλιμα* Aristotle meant merely a greater *degree* of irrelevancy than had characterized Euripides' choral odes, else he would have used "developed" or "consummated" or some similar term in describing what Agathon did rather than *πρώτου ἄρξαντος*. Now if Agathon's irrelevancy differed from Euripides' in kind rather than in degree, perhaps we can get a glimpse as to its nature by inquiring what sort of evidence Aristotle must have employed in forming this opinion about Agathon. It is doubtful if he ever saw one of Agathon's tragedies actually performed in the theater; then his knowledge of Agathon's dramatic art must have been dependent upon the latter's published works. Therefore, if Agathon's *στάσιμα* were notable rather for the music than for the libretto, or consisted of music and dancing without words, or were borrowed from other poets, or if for any reason whatsoever Agathon preferred not to copy them down with the rest of the text but merely to mark their location by XOPOT or some other symbol, then we can understand how Aristotle could know that Agathon had inaugurated something new in dramatic technique. Does not the very word which Aristotle uses (*ἐμβόλιμα*) support this interpretation? Whatever their defects of irrelevancy, Euripides' odes were not "thrown in" in this sense; they were right there in the text. But in Agathon's MSS, on the other hand, there were gaps indicated between acts. In actual performance suitable odes were "thrown in." A "thrown-in" ode would then be one not

¹ Cf. Loeb's translation of Decharme *Euripides and the Spirit of His Dramas* 288 ff.

² Cf. Capps *Am. Jour. Arch.* X (1895) 290 ff.

appearing in the text. To the stage manager *XOPOT* in the MSS would be simply a hint to use any thing he chose or to refer to the poet or that he could depend upon the latter to provide the choreutae with a libretto, according to whatever arrangement they had between them on the subject; to the reader it was convenient as marking off the divisions of the play. Exactly the same thing happens in modern comic opera, where a situation is so fashioned as to lead up naturally to a song or other special feature which is not an integral part of the regular play but is changed at frequent intervals and is technically known as an "interpolated number." Thus, Euripides never dropped the pretense that his odes were as integral a part of his plays as was any other part, and never failed to insert the words in the public editions; but Agathon threw off all disguise by frankly suppressing the libretto in the circulating copies, thereby taking a step which Aristotle considered very significant. If this theory is correct, the use of *XOPOT* in New Comedy can be traced back through Middle Comedy and the close of Aristophanes' career to a simple change which Agathon introduced in the publication of his plays and which was itself a natural outgrowth of the increasing irrelevancy of the choral odes.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY